



p.2, SN 10/797,779

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested in view of the enclosed amendments and the following comments.

The rejection of claims 5 and 7-15 as unpatentable over Stankavich et al, alone or in view of Sawayama et al is respectfully traversed, since the references fail to disclose or suggest applicant's invention. Note particularly that applicant's device includes an alloy solder connection comprising 1.5 to 1.7 % silver by weight, 36 to 38 % lead by weight, and 60.3 to 62.5% tin by weight. These are extremely narrow ranges, and they are shown to be critical in the context of applicant's invention.

Stankavich does not reveal the composition of his completed solder connection. Moreover, Stankavich does not reveal any specific example of process time and temperature for the reflow step that forms the final solder alloy. Without process conditions, and without a disclosure of the final composition, we cannot know and cannot determine the exact composition of the Stankavich alloy. The rejection on Stankavich alone is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

Sawayama et al (col 25, lines 30-36) refers to a solder paste wherein **one phase** of the paste consists of Sn62%Pb36%Ag2%. The other ingredient of the paste is **pure silver**, in a ratio as high as 35% (line 38). The reference does not reveal the composition of the final alloy connection; but it is necessarily substantially more than 2% silver. This is remote from applicant's invention. The rejection is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner did not attempt to show any rational basis for a substitution of the Sawayama paste into the context of Stankavich. If there is any, it would be to substitute the **complete** Sawayama paste for the 2nd solder layer of Stankavich. That would further **increase** the silver content of the final connection. Moreover, there is no comparable reflow step in Sawayama; and therefore we have nothing in Sawayama that could be logically transferred to Stankavich. Nothing in Sawayama tells us the final composition of the Stankavich alloy, as implied by the Examiner. The combination of references is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

The double patenting rejection may be moot in light of the enclosed amendments. Moreover, since the rejection is **provisional**, further discussion can be deferred until one or more claims are allowed in one of the applications.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary C. Honeycutt, RegNo. 20250
972-470-0130

Certificate of Mailing on page 3



p.3 SN 10/797,779

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

It is hereby certified that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in an envelope bearing first class postage, addressed to Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 24th day of May, 2005.

Gary C. Honeycutt
Gary C. Honeycutt

24 May 2005